

Meeting 4/20

Bill Roper, Mitchell, SW, Reynolds, Norman, ^{John Doherty} Baumbach, ~~Stewart~~ Copenhagen, ~~Stewart~~

AH, AK, JG, HRC, GCA

TM, WS, AS, H. Bales, J. Skiles, Jack Carley

I. ① M: can cotinine be properly used?
AK: Scientific debate over - surprised.

John Robinson: problem of unknowns ^{cotinine} of good history.

To get to FTC mic deliv., need known
Covs. down chain to cotinine. Not
known.

JIC, SW, CM, HRC - cotinine where
physics was 1890's - further work
wd be useful as to cotinine, not
as to Barclay or partic. cigarettes.

JIC: Not useful in any res. time frame. FTC
implication on Barclay now.

M: assume some reliable cotinine research.

JR: if assume possible (overlook variables) +
expand scope (more data points - min. 5),
still have trouble w/ getting reliable
dose-response curve.

TM: How long to conduct?

JR: 30 weeks min. - (at least ^{60 min.} 60 min. ^{any valid} ^{scientific} ^{approach})
CM: \$90K for 32-subject 3-week study.

HRC: Probably have to repeat when find
errors from first run.

JIC: How long can you afford to wait?

HB: what if use fewer points?

JR: can't. b/c to do so is to make
assumption about Barclay. At least
have to be made ^{raised} Barclay's trust.

JIC: reaction is
not an
option here.
If FTC
doesn't act,
offer companies
with.

2025046564

JK: may well reach point that all cig's are same.
(i.e., cotinine levels may stabilize at same level).

AS: Consultants suggest that cotinine work
could corroborate KC method.

CM: "Health concern" with delivery, not cotinine (?).
(She be concerned with delivery, not retention.)

AK: Is it really feasible to use such an approach?

IM: Can limit question to this dispute.

AK: Business will not wait.

JIC: Time of the essence.

Beales ② Dilution studies: to what ~~extent~~ extent are
extended filter studies crucial?

HKK: no. Doesn't really matter since all
smokers drop dilute.

Band 100's - something like EF.

AK: fusion in tobacco industry: rela. of dilution's tar.
Where is the B's W dilution study?

AK: doubts about
EF study?

HKK: people take the same
puff - nothing to suggest wd change
b/c of such a change in construction.

HKK: pt. \Rightarrow no change, regardless of cig or
apparatus

identifying
uniformity
of
results

II Remedies

SW ① public annmt ② endorsed conclusions
com-w's, ③ TIN not properly named,
not long, ④ present values when
are misleading - b/c many times higher,
⑤ mod for method, amending report to
delete #'s and, if possible, retesting

2025046565

Barclay for new #'s. Have had access to PM holder for some time. More help available.

FIC has legal authority to do so.

Get new #'s by time FIC itself acts. 2-4 weeks.

Today no need to discuss what if B&W doesn't comply.

JM: "interim"? SW - means "immediate".

JIC - 2 steps: ① ^{reflect results of invest.} ~~immed.~~ ^{invest.} ~~conclude~~ ^{report, etc.}

② Compulsion if nec. to force B&W compliance

JM - 2 sep. points: ① Barclay
② FIC method

JM - why penalize Barclay?

HRK: Barclay - low effc. filter - worst offender of Koguchi is right about hole blocking.

WS: no effect of PM holder on other brands?
No - per PM & RTR.

JM: more evid. on effect of holder? "proceeding"
"now we've missed something more"
Skiles: "hypothetical"

AK: cd have control group test.

JM: "self-help" = duplication? (not really answered)

Secure statement made + ~~notice~~ notice to B&W?
(not long).

JRL: Comment period wd be insignificant.

B&W has had every oppor. to comment.

JM: Consultants differ as to #. Both had by differences? CM: no.

st:
Refers to
Koguchi:
hole blocking
theory
Agree: FIC
not good
the hole
is in the
middle
of the
hole
not in the
middle
of the
hole

CO on

CM:

e.g. of

unilateral

example

Good e.g. of

SW suggested

there was no

consultation

with the
in that case.

Set JM

getting to

know

about

change

2025046566

Cool Ultra in PM holder: 8.8 mg
1.7 FTZ

Bong 85- .7 FTZ
7.7 PM

should have
mentioned
that for
PM
holder
changes

TM: more than one holder at issue. How
can FTC unilaterally decide on PM
holder?

WS: 2 diff. holders produce diff. "tar".

(N.B.: important concession)

WS: FTC has the authority. Q is how to choose?

CM: RTR backed off. Filtrona. "Wasn't right."

Bard "flat" (!)

CM: RTR probably shouldn't have put in
cigarette study. Probably made ~~to~~ say
~~5~~ rather than 9.

AK: See ad.

If can't do #'s in 2-3 weeks, say something ^{now}!

WS: If problem w/ FTC method, is there another
way w/o changing procedure for other
cigarettes?

AK, CM: No - free object of discrim.

AK: Assump. → want to keep w/ FTC method "up and

FTC options
J.I.C. - ~~1~~ (1) ban filter
(2) change machine (plug loophole)
? (3)

WS: what if ban RTR w/ use of FTC method?
How substantiate?

CM: To WS - ~~Have~~ "Have you heard of tar derby?"

in case
of
FTC
return

2025046567

JIC - "put it back the way it was"
CM - "I don't often agree w/ AK"

AK - FTC policy to encourage low tar. If you
abandon now, watch out!

Trickery
in
reverse!

JIC - add a tip! (just another standardized parameter)

AS: what will next big innovation?

CM: FTC action will have "chilling" effect on cheating.
"Better ways to cheat machine! Horvath cd
have come up w/ better cheat."

25?
ef. to
2.5
limitation

SW: one co. complained after 12/81 report - RJR
has changed aks. (ind. of capacity for self-reg.)
SW: "UK & Swit. have banned." (Swiss convinced
by PM presentation.)

CM: "guy took risk of drawing S/H's to
maintain integrity" -
"living a lie"

SW: over dramatic!

TM: extremely useful.

AK: SS, etc.

JIC: forecast?

TM: ASAP; rec's. to FTC.

Doing 2-3 wks to TM
then quit ~~at~~ turnaround
before submitting to Comm'n.

2025046568